

August 5, 1965

sian" (Trident). This series, excerpted from the book, gives some highlights, starting with the encounters between Afro-Asians and the ugly Russian in his own front yard.)

A young Somali beaten senseless for daring to dance with a Russian girl; a boy from Uganda called a black monkey and beaten by a gang of jeering Muscovites; a medical student from Ghana found dead in a suburban Moscow snowbank and fellow Africans, believing he is a victim of foul play, riot outside the Kremlin.

These are a few of the ugly stories that have been brought home to the new countries of Africa by embittered students, many of whom have quit Iron Curtain universities, claiming that racial bigotry is not the exclusive shame of the colonialist-capitalist nations—as the Communists had led them to believe.

"I didn't really want to study in Russia," a thoughtful and gregarious economics major from Ghana explained to George Feifer, an American graduate student at Moscow State University, "but I can honestly say that I was not at all anti-Soviet before I came. That started only after I got to know Russia and the Russians for myself. The Americans waste a lot of money trying to make sure that Africa does not go Communist. All they have to do is pay the way for more of us students to take our degrees here. Ask any of my friends—they're more disillusioned about the Soviet way of life than any American propaganda could make them."

ATTRACTIVE BAIT

The Africa grievances were fully justified on even more profound grounds. To gain African recruits, the Russians and their satellite partners offered attractive bait in lands hungry for learning and short of schools—all-expense-paid scholarships at Communist universities. The Communists were not too selective, accepting students lacking the necessary educational credits. And some students vanished into the East over secret students' routes—without the knowledge of their respective governments.

The African students, by and large, had taken the lure on the assumption that they would learn skills and professions with which to return better equipped to serve their newly independent countries. But they complained about the incessant propaganda, the regimentation on books and travel, the manipulation of their reading and source of information, and the overdose of Marxist doctrine in the classroom.

But the Africans' major complaint was that they were humiliated as Negroes, Abdul Amir Mohammed of Somalia, a former student at Moscow State University, told how Russian students "often surrounded us in a circle and pointed out to each other our hair, our lips, our hands—emphasizing with snickers our racial differences."

One result has been that many African students, unable to maintain their self-respect in the face of unreasoning intolerance, have quit the Communist universities they had so eagerly entered. (Not all African students found it easy to quit. True, the Soviet Government guarantees them transportation to and from their home countries, but the return passage cannot be used until they have been in Russia 4 years.)

OPEN LETTER

Another result was an African "Revolt on the Campus" in Soviet Russia. Many dark-skinned students protested the forced Marxist-Leninism they were subjected to, while their real studies went neglected. They demanded explanations for the repeated beatings of African students caught dating Soviet girls, and for the reprisals taken against the girls. They began holding strategy meetings on how to survive as Africans in the sea of Soviet bigotry around them.

And then a group of student representatives—from Algeria, the Cameroons, the Congo, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Mali, Morocco, Nigeria, the Sudan, Togo, Tunisia, Egypt, and Uganda—drew up an "open letter," sent to the United Nations and all African governments. It stated its aims in unequivocal terms: "To call attention of all African governments to the deceptions, the threats, the pressure, the brutality and the discrimination" that the students had suffered in Soviet Russia.

In February 1960, Nikita Khrushchev decided the best way to handle the students was to segregate them. He announced his plan to establish Friendship University in Moscow, solely for students from Africa, Asia, and Latin America. The institution was soon after renamed Lumumba University, but to the colored students it has always been "Apartheid U."

Lumumba University made it easier for the Soviets to control the students, but at the same time it heightened their sensitivity to Soviet racial discrimination. One of the first students was William Anti-Taylor, a Ghanaian who had studied at the University of Ghana. "There is a big eight-story building facing one of our university buildings on Kabelnaya Street in Moscow," Mr. Anti-Taylor later recalled. "Beside this building is a children's playground. On the balconies of the building, the children of the tenants usually are found playing around their parents who sit enjoying the sun in summer. Is there any African student on Kabelnaya Street who can really say he never has had 'Nigger, Nigger' shouted at him by these children, even in the presence of their parents, who do not care to stop them?"

EMBITTERED ETHIOPIAN

In 1961, an Ethiopian named Mustafa arrived at Lumumba University eager to study his trade—servicing aircraft. He described himself as having "an open mind about politics."

The first thing that annoyed him was discovering that he was to share two small rooms with six other Africans. "It was almost impossible to study," he said.

He was also disturbed to learn that he and other African students got a Soviet allowance of only \$99 a month whereas the Americans and other Westerners got approximately three times as much. At the same time, it hurt his conscience to discover that the Africans were getting three times as much as the Russian students.

"I didn't really mind the Americans getting so much," he said, "but why should I have gotten three times as much as the Russians?"

The fear of Africans mixing with local girls is as persistent in Moscow as in Mississippi. "Komsomolskaya Pravda," the organ of the Young Communist League, purported to tell the story of a Russian girl named "Larissa" who had been in love with a young Communist leader. Then blond-haired "Larissa," otherwise a brilliant law student, met "Mahmoud," an African law student, and after becoming intoxicated at a party, spent the night with him. Later they were married. After leaving the Soviet Union, she was supposedly sold by "Mahmoud" into the harem of a friend. The tale ended with "Larissa" attempting to escape from the harem; but, just before she could reach the Soviet Embassy, she was recaptured.

Africans in Moscow were outraged. They demanded that the editors name the country where the incident supposedly took place. Somewhat flustered, the editors confessed there was no such land and that there had been no such incident. They said they had merely intended to warn Soviet citizens about entanglements with foreigners whose customs might be different from their own. Whatever the official explanation, the message was

clear; Africans were barbarians, and Soviet girls were not to fraternize with them.

GHANAIAN FOUND DEAD

A real shocker came on December 13, 1963, when the body of a 29-year-old Ghanaian medical student, Edmund Asare-Addo, was discovered in a snowbank near the Khovrino railroad station just outside Moscow. The youth, returning to his medical school at Kallinin, 100 miles to the northwest, had been seen boarding a train at Moscow's Leningrad Station the night before.

Mr. Asare-Addo had been planning to marry a Russian girl against strong objections from her parents and friends who opposed such a union on racial grounds. Suspecting foul play, his fellow Africans clamored for an investigation.

Soviet authorities claimed that an autopsy showed no signs of violent death. They said the victim had been drinking. The implication was that he had wandered from his train, collapsed in the snow, and died of exposure.

But two Ghanaian medical students, who had attended the autopsy as observers, denied all this. They said that Mr. Asare-Addo's body bore bruises and other signs of a struggle. They charged the authorities with trying to cover up the truth.

Normally, such a story would not become public knowledge in Russia. But the angry Africans organized a mass demonstration in the Kremlin's Red Square, the likes of which had not been seen since the late twenties when supporters of Leon Trotsky protested his removal by Stalin from the Soviet leadership.

An estimated 500 Africans, many of them wearing the traditional red Ghanaian mourning band on their heads, surged into the square, scuffled with police and climbed over or under a barricade of trucks and cars. Communist officials later launched the rumor that the Africans had demonstrated in Red Square because their demand for brothels had been rejected. But the placards in Russian and English they carried told the story: "Moscow, a Second Alabama," "Stop Killing Africans" and "Moscow Is the Center of Discrimination in Culture."

The students had first assembled in front of the Ghanaian Embassy, where authorities tried vainly to dissuade them from marching on the Kremlin. They marched five abreast, led by a young African girl carrying a picture of Mr. Asare-Addo enclosed in a wreath. Then came the tussle with Soviet police and the rush into Red Square past Lenin's granite tomb and on toward the great Spassky Gate guarding the entrance to the Kremlin.

Few observers could recall ever seeing the gate closed before. But Soviet citizens who witnessed the scene from closed-off side streets, or from the windows of the giant GUM department store, would no doubt long remember the sight of African students singing freedom songs in Red Square, and the sound of the huge Spassky Gate being slammed in their faces.

Hon. Fritz Lanham

SPEECH
OFHON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 4, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues in expressing my sincere sorrow in the passing of the late Congressman, Hon. Fritz Lanham.

A4316

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

August 5, 1965

Fritz was able and outstanding. There never was a more successful Member of Congress than Fritz. He was a perfect gentleman, an eloquent orator and a true Christian. The people of Texas and the Nation have suffered a great loss and we all shall miss him. To his wife, Hazel, and all his folks I express my sincere sympathy.

My Country Is Far From Perfect So Why Am I Proud To Serve It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following article from the San Diego Dispatch of July 30, 1965.

MY COUNTRY IS FAR FROM PERFECT SO WHY AM I PROUD TO SERVE IT?

(By Lt. R. F. Ball)

First of all, have you ever seen or heard of a perfect country? There is no such thing, because all countries are organized, governed, and inhabited by human beings, and men are fallible creatures. Therefore, recognizing that we are not gods, our Founding Fathers attempted the next best thing when they wrote the Constitution. Their goal was to form a more perfect Union than man had ever known before.

The basic idea was, and still is, that men can govern themselves. We do not need a king, a dictator or a small group of "strong men" to tell us how to run our lives. Our Government is designed to reflect the desires of the majority of our individual citizens.

We all know that majority rule would be disastrous for the minority. Therefore, in order to protect the rights of the minority, we have our Bill of Rights which establishes certain individual rights which cannot be taken from the people.

This unusual and complex concept of majority rule with minority protection will always be difficult to master. We have had problems in the past and we are going to have problems in the future, but we are always striving toward the best possible way of life for every man.

Admittedly, things seem to go wrong for us at times, and we complain and grumble about it. We know of injustices which go on about us. These problems are not a result of any basic unjustness of our governmental system. They are the results of a few individual persons who are selfish, ignorant, lazy or indifferent. Unfortunately, there are always a few of these around. Fortunately there are not too many and they are far from representative of the average American citizen and our basic concepts of the American way of life. No matter how many complaints we may hear about our country, we can be certain that we are always striving, always aiming, toward that more perfect union. By exercising our democratic processes, such as our right and privilege to vote, we can demonstrate our concern and insure the steady aim of our country.

We, as individuals, are not immortal on this earth, but the principles and ideals of our country are immortal. They are worth fighting for. We can be proud that we have the opportunity to serve this great Nation.

"We have staked the whole future of America, not on the power of government,

but on the capacity of mankind for self-government"—James Madison, fourth U.S. President.

Freedom Academy Plan Backed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1965

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following newspaper editorial by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick appearing in the Washington Evening Star on Wednesday, August 4, 1965, entitled "Freedom Academy Plan Backed." The column describes the purposes and history of a bill recently reported by the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

FREEDOM ACADEMY PLAN BACKED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The House Committee on Un-American Activities came up with a bill the other day that has been almost wholly ignored in the press. This is a pity, for the bill is a good bill, intended to fill a critical need, and it ought not to be left to languish for want of public discussion.

The bill would create a new seven-man Freedom Commission, whose principal duty would be to establish and maintain a Freedom Academy. And the principal business of the academy would be to teach courses and conduct research in total political warfare against the Communist foe.

Such a proposal is not new. The bill just reported by the House committee is patterned generally upon a measure actually approved in the Senate 5 years ago. Since then, a bipartisan coalition of liberals and conservatives in both Houses has kept the idea alive. Sponsors of the plan include such respected men as MUNDT, CASE, DODD, DOUGLAS, FONG, HICKENLOOPER, MILLER, PROUTY, PROXMIER, SCOTT, and SMATHERS in the Senate, and ICHORD, HEHLONG, GUBSER, BOGGS, GURNEY, CLAUSEN, ASHBROOK, BUCHANAN, and FEIGHAN in the House.

Some of these gentlemen may disagree on details, but they share a common conviction that the people of the United States—and, more critically, the people in key posts in Government—know pitifully little about the nature of communism and the techniques of the Communist conspiracy around the world. By and large, we are babes in this wood. Trustful, innocent, gullible, eager to be loved, Americans by and large refuse to accept the relentless purposes of the Communist ideology. Conventional warfare we understand.

The proposed Freedom Academy would seek to fill this gap through teaching and research. It would maintain a library, publish papers, conduct seminars, cultivate public understanding; and it would draw its students not only from Government agencies, graduate schools and college faculties here at home, but also from key institutions and governments throughout the free world.

Not surprisingly, the State Department is cold to the plan. In State's view, "the bill as a whole would not serve as a useful instrument of national policy." Granted that we must employ not only military strength but also all of the "political, psychological, economic, and other nonmilitary means at our disposal," the State Department "seriously questions whether comprehensive and realistic plans for dealing with the infinitely complex problems of U.S. foreign affairs can

be developed by a new, separate Government agency, especially one without operational responsibilities." In brief, State would leave the job to State.

From a purely administrative viewpoint, the objection may have merit, but it founders in the blunt rebuttal that the State Department itself has failed abysmally to comprehend precisely this field of political warfare. If the State Department, through its Foreign Service Institute, had demonstrated a keen and continuing awareness of Communist imperialism—if it had done its own hard training job—more effective policies might have been devised, first to contain the enemy and then to defeat him.

In any event, the sponsors observe, the Foreign Service Institute exists for purposes at once broader and narrower. Its principal task is to teach the whole of diplomacy to the Department's own personnel. The Freedom Academy would specialize in the field of "Communist external political warfare," and the devising of means to combat it. In the sponsors' view, only an independent agency, cooperating with State, Defense, and the CIA, but separate from them, could run the proposed institution.

The committee report gives no indication of the probable cost of the Freedom Commission (the State Department's cool guess is several million dollars a year), but in terms of total outlays for national security the sum would not be large. Quite conceivably, the investment might bring far greater returns than we got from the \$900 million in foreign aid laid out for Indonesia.

Eugene Zuckert: Story of Dedication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 5, 1965

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to join several of my colleagues who have taken the opportunity to express publicly their admiration for former Air Force Secretary, Eugene M. Zuckert, whose recent retirement causes us mixed feelings—happiness that he will have a much deserved rest; sorrow that he has left Government service; but above all, gratitude for his tireless and effective leadership, his dedication to his job, and his courtesy and kindness to all of his associates.

On February 10, the Air Force Times contained an editorial which calls attention to some of his accomplishments. The record of those accomplishments serve as the best tribute I can think of to this distinguished American. I ask unanimous consent for that editorial to be included in the Record.

The editorial follows:

EUGENE ZUCKERT: STORY OF DEDICATION

WASHINGTON.—Supporters of the Air Force are legion, but a likely candidate for the most dedicated Air Force man is Eugene M. Zuckert, who has completed 4 years as Secretary of the Air Force. That's a record, and all indications point toward Mr. Zuckert's remarkable tenure—most service Secretaries come and go like falling leaves—continuing indefinitely.

Mr. Zuckert first came to USAF in 1947, as a 36-year-old Assistant Secretary under the then Secretary (now Senator) STUART SYM-

Appendix

Freedom Academy Wins Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, now that the House committee in charge of the legislation has unanimously reported favorably on the passage of the Freedom Academy bill, interest and support is rapidly expanding throughout the Nation and it is hoped the House will soon have an opportunity to vote on this vital piece of legislation.

An interesting and informative editorial was recently carried in the Rapid City Sunday Journal, of Rapid City, S. Dak. For the information of the Congress and the country, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM ACADEMY WINS SUPPORT

More war, increasing numbers of young Americans to be involved—that's the program outlined by President Johnson because of the conflict in Vietnam.

Not so much attention was called to action by a committee within the House of Representatives which would establish a Freedom Academy for this Nation.

The Freedom Academy would be the equivalent of West Point, Colorado Springs, or Annapolis—with the objective of preserving freedom in a cold war.

South Dakota's Senator KARL MUNDT has been a sponsor of the measure. The U.S. Senate passed such a bill in 1960 but no action then resulted in the House. Prospects are brighter now—and the need is obvious this year, just as in the past.

Senator MUNDT explains the Freedom Academy would "assist in the development of methods and means employable in both the governmental and private sectors to counter all forms of Communist political warfare, subversion, and insurgency while seeking to preserve and build free and viable societies."

MUNDT endorses the findings of the House committee which note:

"In total war, military defense is only partial defense. Today the major gap in world resistance to communism, the largely undefended front, is the front of nonmilitary or political warfare. The United States has led the organization and development of the free world's military defense in the global struggle. It is imperative that it now take the lead in developing its total defense by closing the serious gap that exists on the front which, in the long run, could be as decisive as the military front."

The committee outlined requirements of such a program as follows:

Policymakers and government personnel at many levels must understand communism in depth, with special emphasis on Communist conflict techniques.

At the upper levels of Government we must have, in addition, officials who understand the full range of methods and means by which this Nation and its Allies can meet the Communist attack and work toward our global objectives systematically. This means that they will have to master a broad range of nonmilitary measures which have yet to be developed and systematized.

Below this level, agency personnel must be trained to understand and implement this integrated strategy in all of its dimensions.

The public must have greater understanding of communism, its objectives, tactics, and methods, especially Communist conflict techniques and the nature of the global struggle, to insure public support of the Nation's efforts to counter Communist aggression. More thorough public knowledge of communism will help prevent the extremism which, frequently arising from misunderstanding or lack of information, creates national dissension and impairs the country's efforts in the global struggle.

The private sector must also be helped in understanding how it can participate in the global struggle in a sustained and systematic manner.

It is necessary to assist, and to enlist the support of, other non-Communist countries by training selected foreign nationals. Equal support and understanding among other peoples and our allies are essential if we are to continue moving forward in a concentrated effort.

A serious gap on the political war front exists when American and Communist techniques and exploitation are compared.

The Freedom Academy would be organized and financed as a Federal training school similar to the colleges which supply officers for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. It would be an educational and research institution, not a policymaking agency.

This Nation seems to lag as friends are counted around the globe, and the inroads of avowed Communists are cause for concern.

Skilled help for the cause of freedom could come from such a college.

Education in the Less-Developed Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of reading a very stimulating speech, a copy of which was sent to me by Mr. John Scott of Time magazine. Mr. Scott delivered this speech before the International Conference of Higher Education held at Oxford, England, on the occasion of the dedication of the English campus of Farleigh Dickinson University, on July 1, 1965.

I am submitting the text for the RECORD as John Scott is one of the most perspicacious observers I know and a tribute to Time magazine:

SPEECH DELIVERED BY JOHN SCOTT OF TIME MAGAZINE

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my good fortune to appear as one of the last speakers in this conference and therefore to have benefited from the remarks of the earlier participants as they analyzed the subject of this conference: "What should be the common elements of a university education in all countries of the world?"

On the basis of what I have heard, I have decided to discard the paper I intended to give on the impact of electronic developments on university education and to devote the 20 minutes which President Sammartino has placed at my disposal to one aspect of the subject of the conference mentioned several times but still imperfectly defined and certainly not resolved. This is the problem of the allocation of the limited resources available in less developed countries for higher education, between the demands of science, technology, and resource development on the one hand, and education in the broad humanities so well defined and so eloquently pled for by Dr. Toynbee in his speech on Tuesday morning. This education finds its highest expression, Toynbee told us, in man's willingness and ability to replace national identity and national allegiance with a feeling of identity with, and allegiance to, the human race.

I intend to approach this problem by citing several examples of problems met with in Soviet education. I have decided to do this for three reasons:

In the first place because I have had some opportunity to observe Soviet education at close range.

In the second place because the subject of this whole conference includes the phrase "in all countries of the world." Though nearly half the human race currently lives in countries dominated by one kind of communism or another, no speaker has dealt in any detail with Soviet education.

In the third place because, as I hope to demonstrate, Soviet experience is relevant to and instructive in analyzing current educational problems in the less developed countries of the world.

I went to the Soviet Union in 1932 as a very young man and worked for several years in a steel mill in the city of Magnitogorsk. A week after my arrival another young man arrived in the city about whom I would like to tell you, because through his eyes and experience I think I can make several points more clearly than I could with historic generalizations or statistics.

Shaimat was a Tartar. He came from an obscure village in central Kazakhstan. When he arrived in Magnitogorsk he had never seen an electric light, a staircase or a locomotive. He had seen a hammer but never used one. He was illiterate. He spoke almost no Russian. He communicated monosyllabically with fellow Tartars in that language. Furthermore, the village from which he came was a backward one and people believed that washing more frequently than once a year was not only dangerous for one's health but verged on the sacrilegious, because it jeopardized the lives of those parasites which they considered normal expressions of man's personality. Shaimat had many such parasites, and for this and other reasons, he was not a person one would select as a close associate—if one had a choice.

A4419

In this case there was not much choice. For Shalmat arrived in our gang in response to an urgent request by the foreman to the personnel department of the plant for an electrician. It was immediately obvious when Shalmat appeared that he was not an electrician. But this did not disturb the foreman who, accustomed to dealing with Soviet reality, did not need an electrician but in fact only a body—a man to sit in a booth where we had motor generators producing direct current for electric welding. There he was to watch an electric light bulb in the ceiling, and when it went out, as it did several times a day as the result of breakdowns in the powerhouse or on the line, he was to switch the motors off, then switch them on again when the juice came back. The foreman undertook to explain this simple operation to Shalmat in sign language and Shalmat went to work.

During his first day he burned out three motors. During the first week several more. For the first month Shalmat sat in his little booth gazing up at the large installations of the mill without any comprehension of what was going on. He had come to Magnitogorsk to get a larger bread ration card—which he had received—and that was the extent of his interest. But gradually two things happened to Shalmat. In the first place he began to learn to speak the Russian language by a sort of osmosis in contact with the people around him. In the second place he began to learn to read in a circle for adult illiterates, of whom there were at that time perhaps 50,000 in the city.

I would see Shalmat at work, laboriously spelling out words from a reader. As he learned to read, and as he learned to speak the language of the area, Shalmat's intellectual horizons suddenly broadened. He became aware of things which we in the West encounter at an early age but which Shalmat in his twenties had previously been unaware of. He learned, for example, that he lived in a country called the Soviet Union. Previously he had been aware of his village and of his province, but not of the Soviet Union. He learned that there was something called the 5-year plan.

I remember his explanation of the substance of the plan: "You see all those machines over there? And these miserable shoes (pointing to his own ragged footwear)? The leather that could have been my shoes was sent abroad to pay for those machines." A simplistic but essentially accurate description of the economics of the first 5-year plan. I remember on another occasion Shalmat's explanation to me of the purpose of our efforts in Magnitogorsk. You see, Shalmat knew that he had come a long way from his village to Magnitogorsk—he had walked about 3 weeks—and he knew that on arrival he had been very ignorant. He had been told by others that I came from America which was even farther away, and he logically concluded that I must have been more ignorant than he had been when I arrived.

On this occasion he undertook to explain to me what we were doing: "You see the idea here is to take that red dirt from the mountain up there and bring it down here and make iron out of it." A simplistic but essentially accurate description of the process of ferrous metallurgy.

From that point on Shalmat went very rapidly. I left the city in 1937 at which time Shalmat was going to night school studying about ergs and amperes, and problems of electrotechnology frequently studied in the West at university level. His way of life had changed radically; he washed regularly, he dressed much better, he read magazines and newspapers. These to be sure were tenuous, but Shalmat's horizons had broadened more than had those of his Tartar antecedents since the day of Genghis Khan.

Shalmat was not alone. The entire community at this time was going through a similar metamorphosis. Some two-thirds of the 230,000 inhabitants of Magnitogorsk were going to some kind of school, studying everything from engineering to literacy, along with obligatory courses in political orientation.

Another example, I got a toothache. In the dental clinic, I found myself being examined by a girl about my own age. She, it turned out, had gone through 4 years of primary school, then had worked in a factory where she was a political activist and a good worker, and was rewarded by being sent to a dental school where spent 3 years. She admitted laconically that she had been rough on her first 200 to 300 patients but "since most of them previously had had no dental care at all, I was an improvement; and now I fill teeth as well as the best."

I myself went to school. I remember vividly the eloquence with which one of my professors at the Institute of Metallurgical Engineering I attended in the evening made lucid poetry of the calculus. I also remember the denuding fatigue with which, after an 8-hour shift in the mill, we spent evenings wrestling with vector analysis.

Magnitogorsk in the 1930's was one of a number of Soviet cities undergoing rapid development, an important aspect of which was a highly pragmatic educational effort directed specifically at teaching people to do necessary things—to fill teeth, design bridges, make steel.

Twenty-five years passed, during which I was engaged in other pursuits. During those 25 years the Soviet Union survived a cruel war. During that generation more than 100 million Soviet adults learned to read and write, and several million went to higher schools where they learned to design, to construct and to operate the tools of peace and the weapons of war.

During this period Soviet education concentrated relentlessly on science and technology. Students had no electives, there was no room in the curriculum for music appreciation or home economics. But every week of every year all had to study the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, political economy and dialectical materialism (the Soviet equivalent of philosophy and ethics). During this period the party maintained absolute control over the education system. The party determined not only the curriculum, but also the budget, the entrance and graduate requirements and the administration.

During this period the question of academic freedom never arose. Indeed, the phrase sounds strange and unreal in the Russian language. For example, Soviet genetics was set back a generation by a conflict between academician Vavilov, a world renowned scholar, and Trofim Lysenko, a party charlatan who for purely political reasons supported the contention that acquired characteristics could be inherited. This argument was "settled" when Vavilov died in a concentration camp leaving Lysenko to dominate the field for a generation. Only years later, after Stalin's death, was Lysenko quietly defrocked.

But in spite of the political controls and other inhibitions in Soviet education, immense progress was made. Recent Soviet feats in space technology are symbolic of the advancements of Soviet education and science in the past generation.

I returned to the Soviet Union recently, making five visits there in the last 7 years. During these visits I saw many of the men and women whom I had known earlier and in some cases met and talked with their children, some of whom were not university students.

I was impressed by the improvements in Soviet living conditions—material, cultural, recreational, artistic. But perhaps most of

all I was impressed at the fact that millions of Soviet citizens are becoming really educated. I mean educated in Dr. Toynbee's sense of the word. Much of this real education did not come as part of the formal schooling, but was acquired in spite of it. It came from reading, thinking, from discussions. Let me illustrate.

I remember being pressed hard by several graduate students on the subject of the categorical imperative. As a defensive ploy, I mentioned to them that when I had attended the Magnitogorsk Institute of Metallurgical Engineering, my professor of dialectical materialism skipped nimbly from Heraclitus to Hegel and then on to Engels and Lenin, with no mention at all of Kant. They shrugged and smiled, "Things have changed. Now they evoke Kant to illustrate the poverty of bourgeois philosophy. But we are not stupid."

Let me illustrate further: My wife and I went to a workers' theater in Leningrad to watch a performance of Macbeth. The production was excellent, the audience responsive. Afterward we took six graduate students from the University of Leningrad to the Astoria Hotel where we spent 2 hours sipping reasonably good Soviet champagne and talking. Though all of our guests were students of technology, they were all actively interested in Shakespeare. I asked them what the play meant to them. "Well," said one, "perhaps for us Macbeth was Stalin, Banquo—Trotsky, Duncan—Nicholas . . . that leaves us with Khrushchev as Macduff."

"You have to reach for that one," said another dubiously. This was discussed for several minutes. Then I asked this question: "Assuming the plausibility of this analogy, who were Macduff's English? Whose foreign troops may be brought into Russia to overthrow a tyranny the Russians themselves seem unable to cope with? Perhaps it might have been the Germans? Or, in the future, the Chinese? Or the Americans?" An intense discussion followed for half an hour. Two of our friends refused to accept the legitimacy of the analogy. The others argued about the propriety of accepting any of the three suggested candidates for the invidious role of helping the Russian people organize a better government.

The discussion ended inconclusively except for one thing. It was clear that these young people were educated. They were discussing intelligently the application of the universal human problems so deftly analyzed and eloquently described by Shakespeare to their own experience.

To illustrate further, let me tell you two students' stories. The first like many European anecdotes is formulated as a question and answer.

Question. What is the difference between capitalism and communism?

Answer. Under capitalism man exploits man. Under communism, it is just the opposite.

Another story, apocryphal but indicative. A capitalist cell was functioning in Moscow. At its surreptitious meetings older members made speeches, younger members asked questions. At one meeting an older member presented a vibrant defense of the free enterprise system. When he had finished a younger member arose and said, "This is fascinating but will it work? Can one change human nature?"

Millions of Soviet citizens are becoming educated in the broad and universal Toynbee sense of the word.

In spite of pervasive restrictions on foreign travel, in spite of the prohibition of critical thinking, in spite of rigid Marxist indoctrination, Russians are becoming educated citizens not only of the Soviet Union but of the world.

It would be presumptuous to say what position he would take on Vietnam if he were alive today. But the principles which would guide him in making that decision ring out true and clear from the record of his public statements.

Speaking at the Republican Convention in Chicago in 1944, he said:

"We want to live in peace.

"We want no territory.

"We want no domination over any nation.

"We want the freedom of nations from the domination of others.

"We want it both in the cause of freedom and because there can be no lasting peace if enslaved people must ceaselessly strive and fight for freedom."

There was no fuzzymindedness in his analysis of the cold war. To him the choice between communism and freedom was crystal clear. He said: "The world is divided by opposing concepts of life. One is good, the other is evil."

Yet, while he hated the Communist idea the great humanitarian had no hatred for the Russian people. It was his leadership after World War I which helped feed and save the lives of millions of Russian children.

In summary, the principles which Herbert Hoover would apply in making a foreign policy decision could be summed up in one sentence. He wanted peace, freedom, non-intervention, self-determination, and progress for all peoples and all nations.

America's critics at home and abroad contend that our policy at Vietnam is diametrically opposed to every one of these principles.

They contend that America is intervening in a civil war.

They contend that we are fighting a losing battle to perpetuate white colonialism in Asia.

They contend that we are on the side of reaction, resisting the forces of change and progress.

They contend that we are increasing the danger of world war III.

Even among the majority of Americans who support our policy too many seem to believe that we had no business getting involved in Vietnam in the first place and that all we can hope or try to do is to make the best of a bad situation.

There is no reason for Americans to be defensive or apologetic about our role in Vietnam. We can hold our heads high in the knowledge that—as was the case in World War I, World War II, and Korea—we are fighting not just in the interests of South Vietnam or of the United States but for peace, freedom, and progress for all peoples.

This is not a case of American intervention in a civil war. We are helping South Vietnam resist Communist intervention.

We are not attempting to impose American colonialism in Vietnam. We are there to prevent Communist colonialism and to preserve the rights of self-determination without outside intervention for the people of South Vietnam.

We are fighting on the side of progress for the Vietnamese people; the Communists are fighting against progress. One of the reasons the South Vietnamese have been willing to fight so long and so bravely against the Communists is that they know that North Vietnam, under communism is an economic slum. The per capita income of South Vietnam under freedom is twice as high as that of North Vietnam.

The greatest fallacy is the contention that U.S. policy in Vietnam increases the danger of war. On the contrary, stopping Communist aggression will reduce the danger of war. Failing to stop it will increase the danger of war.

This is true because, if the Communists gain from their aggression, they will be encouraged to try it again.

It is true because, if aggression is rewarded those who advocate the hard line in Peking and Moscow will have won the day over those who favor peaceful coexistence, and we shall be confronted with other Vietnams in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

It is true because, if the Communists gain from their aggression in Vietnam, all of southeast Asia would come under Communist domination, and we would have to fight a major war to save the Philippines.

A crucial issue is being decided in Vietnam: Does the free world have an answer to the Communist tactic of taking over a free country not by direct attack as in Korea, not by winning a free election, but by fomenting and supporting a revolution? If this tactic proves unsuccessful in Vietnam, the steady Communist march to world domination will be halted. If it succeeds, the Communists will have the green light for conquest by support of revolution all over the world, and we will be helpless to stop it.

This is one of those critical turning points in history. Today Russia and Red China are not allies. Red China without Russia is a fourth-rate military power with no significant nuclear capability. Five years from now the two Communist giants may have patched up their differences. Even if they have failed to do so, Red China will then have a dangerous nuclear capability.

Time, therefore, is not on our side. If the Communist aggressors are not stopped now, the risk of stopping them later will be infinitely greater.

Too much of the discussion on Vietnam has been in the dreary terms of day-to-day tactics, of targets to be hit or excluded, of the cost involved.

It is time for all Americans to raise their eyes proudly to the great goals for which we are fighting in Vietnam.

We are fighting in Vietnam to prevent world war III.

We are fighting for the right of self-determination for all nations, large and small.

We are fighting to save free Asia from Communist domination.

We are fighting for the right of all people to enjoy progress through freedom.

We are fighting to prevent the Pacific from becoming a Red sea.

To achieve these goals, Americans must be united in their determination not to fail the cause of peace and freedom in this period of crisis.

The noisy minority which constantly talks of the need to make concessions to the Communist aggressors in order to gain peace are defeating the very purpose they claim to serve. This kind of talk discourages our friends, encourages our enemies, and prolongs the war.

The Communists do not have to be told that we are for peace; they have to be convinced that they cannot win the war.

We shall agree to any honorable peace but on one issue there can be no compromise: There can be no reward for aggression.

Forcing the South Vietnamese into a coalition government with the Communists would be a reward for aggression.

Neutralizing South Vietnam would be a reward for aggression.

Forcing the South Vietnamese to give up any territory to the Communist aggressors would be a reward for aggression.

History tells us that a coalition government would be only the first step toward a complete Communist takeover.

Neutralization, where the Communists are concerned, as we learned in Laos, would mean—we get out, they stay in, they take over.

Attempting to buy peace by turning over territory to the Communist aggressors would only whet their appetite for more.

We welcome the interest of the United Nations in seeking a settlement. But we

must insist that where the security of the United States is directly threatened by international Communist aggression, the final policy decision must be made by the United States and not by the United Nations.

We respect the views of nations who choose to remain neutral in the struggle between communism and freedom. But in evaluating those views let us remember that no nation in the world could afford the luxury of neutrality if it were not for the power of the United States.

The struggle will be long. The cost will be great. But the reward will be victory over aggression and a world in which peace and freedom will have a better chance to survive.

Herbert Hoover's record gives us guidance also with regard to our future policy when peace finally comes in Vietnam.

The man who hated communism helped save the lives of millions of Russian people living under communism after World War I.

The man who hated dictatorship set up the Committee for Small Nations to aid the people forced to live under Hitler's dictatorship in World War II.

Herbert Hoover took a dim view of trade or aid programs which might strengthen the power of dictatorial governments over their people. That is why he insisted that American aid to the starving Russian people be administered not by the Communist government but by the American Relief Administration which he headed.

We must continue to step up our air and sea attacks on North Vietnam until the Communist leaders stop their aggression against South Vietnam. But completely consistent with that policy would be the establishment now of an American Committee To Aid the People of North Vietnam.

What I am suggesting is not a government-to-government program which would simply strengthen the domination of the Communist Government of North Vietnam over the people of that unhappy country but a people-to-people program. The American people, through contributions to such a committee, would send to the people of North Vietnam food, medicine, clothing, and other materials which would help them recover from the devastating destruction of war.

If the government of North Vietnam raised objections to allowing an American agency to administer the program, the distribution of supplies could be undertaken by an independent agency like the International Red Cross.

Certainly a program of this type would be in the great humanitarian tradition of Herbert Hoover.

As we consider the problems we face, let us not overlook one great factor which is working in our favor in Asia.

Twelve years ago, the Communist propaganda in Vietnam and in other free Asian nations was based on one major theme—choose communism and you will enjoy a better way of life.

Today that propaganda line no longer has any credibility. Those who join the Vietcong in Vietnam do so not because they like communism, but because they fear it.

In the past 12 years the only nations in southeast Asia and the Pacific which have enjoyed sustained economic progress are those in which freedom has been given a chance—Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand, and Malaysia. The economic failures have been Communist China and Communist North Vietnam and Burma and Indonesia—both of which chose the Socialist road to economic bankruptcy.

There is a lesson in this record for America. At a time when other nations are turning toward freedom, let us not turn away from it.

Herbert Hoover spoke eloquently on this subject at West Branch on his 75th birthday:

"A splendid storehouse of integrity and freedom has been bequeathed to us by our forefathers. Our duty is to see that that storehouse is not robbed of its contents.

"We dare not see the birthright of posterity to independence, initiative, and freedom of choice bartered for a mess of a collectivist system."

Again on his 80th birthday he returned to the same theme:

"It is dinned into us that this is the century of the common man. The whole idea is another cousin of the Soviet proletariat. The uncommon man is to be whittled down to size. It is the negation of individual dignity and a slogan of mediocrity and uniformity.

"The greatest strides of human progress have come from uncommon men and women.

"The humor of it is that when we get sick, we want an uncommon doctor. When we go to war, we yearn for an uncommon general. When we choose the president of a university, we want an uncommon educator.

"The imperative need of this Nation at all times is the leadership of the uncommon men or women."

And, just 1 year ago on his 90th birthday, he reminded his fellow countrymen again for the last time: "Freedom is the open window through which pours the sunlight of the human spirit and of human dignity."

We were privileged to have lived in the same century with this uncommon, extraordinary man. As we meet in this typically American town, in the heartland of our country, may we honor his principles as we pay tribute to his memory.

Freedom Academy Bill Advancing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, unanimous committee approval in the House of the Freedom Academy bill has stimulated greatly expanded interest in and support for the inauguration of this badly needed program for training America's peacetime operatives in the cold war.

Likewise, our continuing problems in Vietnam provide a daily reminder of the deficiencies involved in a national program which relies too greatly on guns and bombs, on blood and bullets, to win enduring victories which cannot be obtained without a sharply revised and reinforced approach to the problems of training our friends in South Vietnam on the important and imperative techniques required to maintain a stable, sound, and strong civilian government capable of preserving the victories won in a shooting war.

South Dakota newspapers have with great unanimity expressed their approval of the Freedom Academy approach and I ask unanimous consent that there appear in the Appendix of the Record a recent editorial from the Aberdeen, S. Dak., American News under the heading of "Freedom Academy Bill Advancing."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FREEDOM ACADEMY BILL ADVANCING

South Dakotans, aware of the merits of the Freedom Academy proposal that has

been advocated for years by Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, are encouraged by the progress it has made this summer.

The Freedom Academy bill, a measure to establish a comprehensive nonmilitary program to meet political warfare needs in the global struggle against communism, has been given unanimous approval by the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Although the bill, introduced by Senator MUNDT, in 1959, had won Senate approval in 1960 it had been victim of a legislative jam in the House.

With reintroduction in the House and Senate this year—under Senator MUNDT's guidance—the bill received a helpful recommendation from the committee report.

The report outlined the effectiveness and history of Communist efforts in political warfare and detailed the fact "there is a serious gap in the defenses of the United States, and the non-Communist world generally, on the political warfare front." It said: "There is a vital and pressing need for an extensive and thoroughgoing program of education, research, and training in this area to close the gap."

In additional argument in favor of the bill the committee report said:

"Clearly, if freedom is to remain a distinguishing characteristic of our civilization, if world peace and the national interests of the United States are to be preserved, communism must be decisively countered and checked . . . (The Communists have developed) a new form of warfare which has enabled them to render conventional military power ineffective in many situations. The new form of warfare is variously referred to as nonmilitary, political, unconventional, total, or fourth-dimensional warfare, protracted conflict, etc. . . . Communist capabilities in this new type of warfare are the result of a massive development and training program which began decades ago, in secret, conspiratorial meeting and has been continued in and through a vast network of so-called political warfare or political training schools.

"The challenge to the United States and its allies today is not to atomize the military installations and capital cities of world communism. Rather, it is to meet the Communists on all fields of battle in this new form of warfare and emerge victorious in order that nuclear war may be prevented . . . (The United States) has led the organization and development of the free world's military . . . It is imperative that it now take the lead in developing its total defense by closing the serious gap that exists on the front which . . . could be as decisive as the military front . . . It is essential that a thoroughgoing program of research, education, and training in the area of Communist political warfare be established."

Developments in world affairs since Senator MUNDT started his campaign for the Freedom Academy bill should strengthen the support for it.

Many Americans would like to see Congress approve the bill without further delay.

Military Construction Appropriation Bill, 1966

SPEECH OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 10, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10323) making

appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, last November the Department of Defense announced closure of several bases. Among them was an Air Force radar station at Naselle in Pacific County in my congressional district in the State of Washington.

The contemplated closure of this 13-year-old Naselle air base will remove from Pacific County 180 military and 20 civilian workers and their families with a payroll of more than \$1 million—about 8 percent of the annual nonfarm income.

Estimates indicate that about 350 persons will be affected. Naselle School District will lose 81 students and undoubtedly also will lose Federal payments for their education as other school districts have lost such funds when defense bases have been deactivated.

Total population of Pacific County in 1964 was approximately 14,000 and the loss of the personnel now manning and serving Naselle Radar Station will mean that a substantial percentage of the population will be lost to this area.

For many years Pacific County has been one of the depressed areas under the criteria developed by the Area Redevelopment Administration. On February 1, the unemployment rate was approximately 17 percent. It has not risen above that mark for more than a few months in the last decade. Thus, the significance of the radar site at Naselle to the economic health of the community is readily apparent.

The Air Force invested considerable money in this installation. It must be presumed that its technicians knew what they were doing when in 1950 this base was built as an aircraft control and warning installation on top of a 2,000-foot mountain at a cost of about \$6 million. These technicians must have known also what they were doing when an additional \$650,000 was invested to convert the equipment to a SAGE heavy radar site.

Again, the Air Force technicians must have known what they were doing when in 1962 a further sum of \$72,000 was invested in an improved communications system which was placed in service on November 15, 1962.

Further confidence in the Naselle site was evidenced by the Air Force when in 1963 the Naselle site was selected as a key link in the improved communications system now being built by the Air Force.

At this time, we should be reminded, also, that this Naselle Air Radar Station has an outstanding record. It has been operating when others in the immediate vicinity had broken down or in some way had failed to carry out their intended mission.

Consistently, the efficiency of the base has ranked high among similar installations.

I would like also to quote from a letter I received from Mr. Carlton Appelo, manager of the Western Wahkiakum County Telephone Co., dated January 18, 1965:

Appendix

Soil Conservation in West Virginia EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the July 1965 issue of the Department of Agriculture publication, *Soil Conservation*, featured a look at Appalachia, its problems, past corrective programs, and future efforts for economic betterment of the region.

One of the articles in the publication dealt with West Virginia, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the Record.

There being no objection, the article, "In Perspective," was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A LOOK AT APPALACHIA: IN PERSPECTIVE—WEST VIRGINIA FLASHBACK TRACES EBB AND FLOW OF PEOPLE AND PROSPERITY IN HIGHLAND AREA

(By Glendon P. Burton and Ross Mellinger, area conservationist, SCS, Parkersburg, and Woodland Conservationist, SCS, Morgantown, W. Va.)

Let's take a trip into a part of Appalachia from the junction of the Little Kanawha and Ohio Rivers at Parkersburg, W. Va. Our flashback in time will take us over 165 years of land-use history in one of America's unique resources regions.

Starting about 1800, we join up with the first settlers traveling by boat and on foot eastward along the Little Kanawha River and its tributaries into Wood, Wirt, Ritchie, Calhoun, and Roane Counties. They gain footholds in the wilderness along the stream.

When their first rough shelters are built, they spread out from the stream bottoms to conquer the hills. Their growing families and improving markets for food and timber force them to clear the steep hillsides. They find the soil is good. They can grow corn, wheat, hay, and pasture.

INDUSTRIAL BOOM

In the 1860's, the discovery of oil at Burning Springs, Wirt County, sets off a booming oil and gas industry. Oilfield workers establish homesteads farther back in the hills. There is soon a family in every hollow.

Oil did for the Kanawha River area what coal mining did to much of the rest of Appalachia—stimulated an industrial development that left its workers stranded when the resource faded.

Soon lumberjacks move in with axes, saws, and oxen to move the timber to the streams. Trees that can't be sold for timber are logged and burned. Leases to clear land for three crops of corn are common.

Food must be grown for home use; and for barter; woodland must be changed to pasture to grow cattle and sheep. There is no corner grocery store or supermarket. This is a period when each farm is nearly a self-sufficient unit. The land responds to human needs—but at a price.

During World War I more steep land is plowed for grain. Farmers soon begin to notice that the plow often strikes rock where

it didn't before. Are the stones growing out of the soil?

PRICE OF THE FLOW

Parts of the field are now red instead of brown and the corn doesn't grow well there. Gullies begin to appear. Even when plowed in or filled with stones, they soon wash out again.

Pasture fields don't green-up as early in the spring; strange grasses and weeds begin to replace bluegrass. On steep slopes the land begins to slip and slide in large chunks.

The streams run muddy red after hard rains, and they completely dry up in the summer. Dug wells have to be dug deeper. What is happening to the land and water?

This is a period of large farms for hill country. Many are 200 acres or more. Wheat and oats are often cradled on fields too steep for a binder. Corn is the big grain crop. Hillside plows and sure-footed teams make it possible to plant the steepest slopes. The average mechanized farm of this period has a team of horses, hay rake, two-horse mowing machine, a wagon, and a sled.

This is truly the time of the family farm. The whole family works from dawn to dusk. But it is not an unhappy time. Neighborly visits; exchange of labor at harvest time; Saturday night in town; Sunday at church; husking bees; homecomings; picnics and political rallies—these provide social contacts and recreation.

THE WEARY ROAD

Roads are a real problem. The soils contain heavy red clay; slips and slides are common. From early November until the first of May, travel for any distance is a major task. Horses sink to their knees and wagons to the axles when the ground softens. A hard road is a rare treat for the mud-weary traveler.

Following the big family period, farms become smaller. Land is being divided up among heirs, until in the 1930's the average-size farm is about 100 acres. About 30 acres is woodland; the other 70 equally divided between pasture and former cropland used as meadow. Farmers have a subsistence level of living, but wants are few and some folks comment that they made it through the depression years by "lack of expense."

Soils are impoverished and eroded; livestock prices are riding the bottom; there is little incentive for farmers to invest in large-scale soil improvement measures. In fact, it is almost impossible to find the money, no matter how attractive the promised returns. Yet this period spawns the soil conservation program and the concept of "using land within its capabilities and treating it according to its needs for protection and improvement."

EXODUS BEGINS

During and after World War II, the rapid expansion of industry creates new jobs. Young people leave the farm. The old folks pass away or retire, and many farmsteads are abandoned. Population declines rapidly, and the land starts to revert to its original state of the 1800's—timber.

The farmers who stay see that it takes more and better land, more intensively used, to survive.

Mechanization joined with modern soil conservation techniques turn the trick. But only a few farms can do this because the kind of land needed is scarce.

Now, on long weekends the children and grandchildren return to the old homestead,

driving late model cars. The young people left Appalachia to earn their way in industrial areas of the Piedmont and East. There they established a reputation as excellent workers in industry.

A few small industries appear in Harrisville, Grantsville, Elizabeth, and Spencer—clothing, rubber goods, metal fabrication, and wood products are manufactured. These help utilize the skills of local people, but there is still a surplus of labor and the better opportunities for ambitious young people lie elsewhere.

In the 1960's, local leaders begin to study their communities and themselves. They realize that the vision of large industries, employing thousands of people, appearing back in the hills, as if by magic, is only a dream. They agree that progress must come mostly from conservation and development of the region's natural resources, supplemented by small industries where possible. They adopt the "drop your bucket where you are" philosophy.

WOOD IS HOPE

With 68 percent of the land now in woodland and with 1.73 billion board feet of timber on good timber-growing soils, wood-using industries are developing. Pulpwood is being produced from the pine that sprang up on the old crop fields. Trees are being planted. Sawmills and wood-treating plants are starting to utilize the hardwoods. The idea of tree farming for continuous production is catching on.

In the 1960's, soil and land use problems are still present. After heavy rains, the streams still run red. We see raw, eroded areas in overgrazed pastures; slips and slides on hillsides; eroding road banks and streambanks.

Here and there, as we get close to Parkersburg, we see erosion problems created by ill-planned housing developments as the city moves to the country.

We see thousands of acres of rough, unstable land gradually being taken over by low-value trees and brush. We wonder if good trees will be planted on these areas before it is too late and too costly.

Roads are still a problem. Designed to "get farmers out of the mud," hard tops were put on old roadways. They are not suitable for high speed travel and heavy loads. Bridges are small and posted with low load limit signs. We wonder how heavy wood products can be moved to market over these inadequate roads and bridges.

Where roads are good, people who like rural living locate homesites. Some are factory workers in plants along the Ohio River. Some are retirees. Some are former residents returned to the scenes of their childhood. Where roads provide quick transportation, they prefer to live in the country.

BEAUTY BECKONS

The great natural beauty of this land in the spring, summer, and fall beckons the vacationer. The Little Kanawha River is noted for its bass, muskies, and big catfish. In the woodlands, squirrels, grouse, and deer are plentiful and on the increase. A good boating pool is located behind the Elizabeth Dam. All of these things, plus many other outdoor activities, are recreational opportunities yet to be fully developed.

We wonder what it's going to take to effect the conservation and development of natural resources necessary for better living in this part of Appalachia.

Landowners cooperating with soil conservation districts have succeeded in curbing erosion and improving land use on individual properties. Some with adequate land resources for profitable agriculture have found a measure of security. But not more than 50 percent of the land has been placed under safe and profitable conservation management.

A small watershed project on Bonds Creek provides protection to valley farmers and recreation facilities for the city of Pennsylvania, but its 9,435 acres is just a patch on the mountainous terrain needing such coordinated planning and treatment.

Currently, committees of local leaders are exploring the possibilities of a Resource Conservation and Development project for five counties under the Department of Agriculture program administered by the Soil Conservation Service.

And now, the Appalachian Regional Development Act offers promise of new aids for building a stable economy on the region's natural resources.

Of one thing we are sure—the land endures and if the people put their minds and hands to it, they can fashion a good life in Appalachia.

St. Louis Globe Sparks Freedom Academy Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the St. Louis Globe carried a column by Edward O'Brien, a well-known and respected Washington correspondent, bringing attention to a bill which is presently awaiting action in the Committee on Rules and Administration and a bill on which this House will soon be required to act. The column ably points out the connection between our situation in Vietnam and the need for the Freedom Academy. Had the Freedom Academy been established 10 years ago I would dare to say there would be no need for American troops in Vietnam today. The present premier of that war-torn land has stated on several occasions that one of the key problems of the war is acquiring and maintaining the support of private citizens. Few would deny that the Communists have created this war through the efforts of trained professional insurgents. Vietnam is no civil war. Vietnam is not a legitimate revolutionary war. Vietnam is the result of professional agitation, initiated and directed by Communist powers. Armed intervention will not prevent wars of liberation. Only through concentrated nonmilitary efforts by the United States and the free world can the citizens of the world be afforded the opportunity to choose between self-government and communism; for as it is now only the other side presents their case to the people on their level and in a manner conducive to organization and support.

Without further comment, I recommend the above mentioned article to the attention of the Congress. Mr. Speaker,

under unanimous consent I place an article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat written by Edward O'Brien and entitled, "Washington" at this point in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON
(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—Topic A in this city is the military conflict in Vietnam and President Johnson's search for acceptable means to turn the Communist victories at least into a stalemate.

But little thought is being given to the larger problem that lies beneath the Vietnam fighting and will persist and grow in other countries. This is the fact that Communist warfare takes many forms other than military, that these Red nonmilitary techniques are highly developed, and that the non-Communist world has not yet learned how to overcome them.

As the Vietcong reap their victories, there is, however, a new stirring in Congress and the beginning of recognition that the United States must make a genuine effort to understand Communist use of political, ideological, psychological, sociological, technological, economic, and other nonmilitary weapons.

A few days ago the House Committee on Un-American Activities approved a bill, sponsored by Representative RICHARD H. ICHORD, Democrat, of Missouri, to establish a Freedom Academy as an independent Government agency that would mount a comprehensive nonmilitary program to meet the Communists cold war offensive.

Though the Academy idea has been lying around in various congressional bills since 1959, this was the first time the proposal has moved as far as committee approval in the House. The Senate approved a similar bill in 1960 but since then, the Academy has been stalled, apparently because of opposition by Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, the foreign relations committee chairman.

In a speech in 1961, President Kennedy seemed to be agreeing to the need for something like the Freedom Academy.

"We dare not fail to grasp the new concept, the new tools, the new sense of urgency we will need to combat (communism) . . . we intend to reexamine and reorient our forces of all kinds, our tactics, and our institutions," he said.

In the Senate, the proposal has always had support from Democrats and Republicans, Liberals and Conservatives. The Senate Judiciary Committee said of the 1960 bill:

"This is the first measure to recognize that a concentrated development and training program must precede a significant improvement in our cold war capabilities. The various present agencies and bureaus can be shuffled and reshuffled, but until they are staffed by highly motivated personnel who have been systematically and intensively trained in the vast and complex field of total political warfare, we can expect little improvement in our situation. This one, lone Freedom Academy can lay the foundation for a major breakthrough."

At present, the United States does not even possess an adequate library for research and training in political warfare. The State Department, U.S. Information Agency, and other agencies working directly in the field do no more than brush the subject in preparing their professionals.

The Communists, on the other hand, have operated, for almost 50 years, dozens of first-class political warfare schools for Reds of every country. The Vietcong subversion and terror in South Vietnam are a result.

The State Department has always opposed Freedom Academy bills, claiming, though the record shows otherwise, that the same job can be handled by State or other existing agencies. It wants no rivals in the field of international relations.

The other factor is the belief held by many State Department officials and by Senator FULBRIGHT that the cold war is over, making the Freedom Academy concept obsolete. But Representative ICHORD and others merely have to point to Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, and dozens of other hotspots to show that freedom is in greater peril than ever.

Shrine Award Presented to O. Carlyle Brock

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 16, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Imperial Session of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America was held here in Washington from July 12 to July 16, 1965. During the opening session the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma of the Eloy International Foundation of the Republic of Panama was bestowed upon my friend, fellow Shriner, and constituent O. Carlyle Brock who had served as Imperial Potentate of the Shrine for North America during the year 1964-65. The presentation address was made by Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American Provost of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, and the formal presentation was made by the newly elected Imperial Potentate, Barney Collins. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Bayern's remarks and the acceptance speech of O. Carlyle Brock be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Imperial Sir, O. Carlyle Brock, Imperial Potentate for the Shrine for North America, we are assembled here this afternoon to honor you, our dedicated and distinguished leader of nobility for North America.

You have been voted the highest honor of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama, in recognition of your outstanding service to mankind, and for your merit and accomplishments in all worthy endeavors, including the shrine's hospitals, and in further recognition of your untiring efforts toward the establishment of international peace.

This foundation, named after the soldier, patriot, statesman, martyr, the former president of Ecuador, at the turn of the century, is for the perpetuation of justice, truth, and friendship among peoples and nations; and seeks to promote the moral values with personal integrity, for which General Alfaro devoted and laid down his life.

President Alfaro (1842-1912) established in Latin America, many schools, colleges and universities, as well as hospitals and other welfare institutions; and furthered cooperation and unity among the countries of the entire Western Hemisphere. Under his leadership, the legislature of Ecuador passed laws, separating church and state.

Whenever there was a threat to the peace in the Western Hemisphere, he was the dynamic leader who brought about a peaceful settlement of such disputes.

General Alfaro sowed the seeds for Pan American understanding and cooperation. In 1907 he called a peace conference in Mex-

August 17, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4577

And as one person explained it, neither of the planes on order, the medium-range Boeing 727 three-engine jet or the short-to-medium range Douglas DC-9 two-engine jet, would appear to be the total answer for the region.

The Boeing ship, of course, isn't meant for short-haul operations. And the DC-9, although designed for local service, or regional routes, possibly won't be able to operate effectively out of most of the 22 New England airports now served by Northeast.

Thirteen of these airports have runways shorter than 5,000 feet, the minimum figure being used for the DC-9, and limited passenger yields at such fields would not justify the spending of large sums for runway expansion.

Then, again, the DC-9 ordered by Northeast isn't a "small" jet in any sense, even though it can operate on route segments as short as 100 miles.

It is a plane that will seat up to 115 passengers—and thus hardly suited to the light traffic loads of the so-called intra-New England network. Undoubtedly, however, it will be utilized on some of the more heavily traveled, and longer routes.

If the analysis is correct, where will this leave the rest of New England?

Well for one thing, Northeast has not said that the DC-9, is the complete answer to better New England service.

Furthermore, it seems likely that the carrier has additional aircraft purchases in mind, planes better suited to the majority of the New England communities it serves.

The concern about regional air service is understandable, particularly in the areas north of Boston.

But Northeast has found its financial legs—or should it be wings—in spectacular fashion.

STRONG FEELING OF OPTIMISM

And in view of the vitality being shown by its new owners, it isn't surprising to sense a strong feeling of optimism emerging about the future of New England air service.

The New England air market has been permitted to wither. But it is ripe for development, in the opinion of many, and the new look at Northeast may give it its chance for growth.

Obviously, it is in Northeast's interests, as part of its effort to keep the Florida route, to give solid service wherever it operates, whether to Montreal, New York, Miami, Burlington, Bangor or Berlin.

A \$100 million airplane order would appear to be as good a sign as any that Northeast, all but down and out a few short months ago, is making the kind of dramatic comeback that will benefit all the areas it serves, including New England.

PS. A reminder that Northeast is helping the Jimmy Fund, too, by offering three scenic flights out of Logan Airport each Saturday afternoon in August.

Tickets—for contributions of \$5 or more—are available at Northeast ticket offices, or at the airport, on a first come-first serve basis, on Saturdays.

Federal Government and Arizona: Partners in Crime and Vice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to tell the Members of this

House about the ignorant partnership of the Federal Government and the State of Arizona in keeping gambling illegal in Arizona thus making gambling's lucrative profits available to finance the needs of the crime syndicates.

Last year, the parimutuel turnover in Arizona came to \$22 million. More significant—and more menacing—is Arizona's illegal gambling, which makes Arizona parimutuels look puny. Testimony before the McClellan committee indicated that off-track betting comes to about \$50 billion annually throughout the Nation, with this figure accounting for only some 42 percent of the national annual illegal gambling total, which would thus be \$120 billion. On a population basis, illegal gambling in Arizona would come to about \$1 billion a year. The mob cuts itself 10 percent of the illegal gambling take, which means that Arizona could be an as much as \$100-million desert treasure trove for the syndicates. Government-run gambling would siphon these moneys from mob treasuries, putting gambling revenues to work at public rather than criminal tasks.

The best way to make gambling work for the public good—since it is basically ineradicable—is a national or series of State lotteries. If the State of Arizona would wake up to social and financial reality, it would legalize, regulate, and control gambling so that the gambling urge of the people of Arizona could be made to benefit the people rather than buttress the mob.

Legislative Reapportionment**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the August 16, 1965, issue of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, entitled "Rejiggered Dirksen Amendment."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REJIGGERED DIRKSEN AMENDMENT

Senator DIRKSEN's determination to get through Congress a constitutional amendment modifying the drastic one-man, one-vote ruling the U.S. Supreme Court on legislative reapportionment, is commendable. Whether he can succeed in securing the adoption of this revised version is debatable.

Even if he manages to obtain the necessary two-thirds' majority in the Senate, despite the threatened filibuster by "liberals"—who consider the filibuster an instrument of Beelzebub when used by anybody but themselves—he will have to get a two-thirds' vote in the House. Then three-fourths of the State legislatures will have to ratify.

All this is extremely difficult, given the amount of pressure that has been applied against the Dirksen amendment, especially by civil rights and labor organizations. Mr. DIRKSEN's revised version should take care

of most of the objections, but whether it will or not is uncertain.

DIRKSEN was quoted, after he failed by seven votes to get the required two-thirds in the Senate, as saying:

"Several Members sneaked up on my blind side and said they would like to give me a vote, and that something may develop that they could."

An absolute requirement that there be a reapportionment of both branches of every State legislature every 10 years, to take account of the census, is a feature of the revised Dirksen amendment. It would have to be approved by both branches, and then by the voters of the State in referendum, if one branch were apportioned on any basis other than population.

Senator DIRKSEN stresses the thought in advocating the foregoing that it puts in the hands of the voters of a given State the final decision as to whether the plan should be adopted. It is hard to see how even the "knee-jerk liberals" can find any plausible objection to that—but they probably will.

There is always the possibility that if this method of writing an amendment to curb the one-man, one-vote principle fails, two-thirds of the State legislatures will petition Congress to call a constitutional convention. Such a convention would not be limited, and, as Senator HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania puts it, this might really open up a "bucket of eels."

Either 22 or 23 of the required 34 States, including Virginia, have already petitioned for such a constitutional convention, according to a study made by the Library of Congress for Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON. Many, including Senator ROBERTSON, doubt, however, if the needed 34 State legislatures will ever sign the petition. The possibility that they might do so was held over the Senate's recent deliberations, in the hope of getting Senate approval for the Dirksen amendment.

But the prospect that a convention called by petition of the States would be wide open, and hence free to rewrite the entire Constitution, may well prevent any such convention from ever being brought together.

So it appears that if the one-man, one-vote principle is to be modified—and it certainly should be—the best hope of action is through the rejiggered Dirksen amendment.

Academic Freedom**EXTENSION OF REMARKS**

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, in New Jersey many of our leaders have a problem involving the remarks of a professor which many of us feel very distasteful and repugnant to our beliefs and I was impressed by an editorial in the Advocate on academic freedom I thought my colleagues would like to read.

The editorial follows:

[From the Advocate, July 22, 1965]

ACADEMIC FREEDOM—I

In our democracy, free and open discussion is essential to assure mature action. Thus administration policy in military matters is enthusiastically supported by some and energetically questioned by others. An instance was the vigorous exception to administration policy in Vietnam taken by a Rutgers professor.

Governor Hughes, while disagreeing with the professorial "prejudices and opinions" enunciated, reminded alarmed critics that the "security of the Nation . . . is intended to protect the basic principles of the American system and these include freedom of debate as well as academic freedom."

Just what is "academic freedom"? Traditionally it is described as the freedom of scholars to direct their search for truth and to report the results of their findings. Those who feel that many more incompetent people are kept on faculty payrolls in the name of academic freedom, than are dismissed in violation of it contend that the modern definition seems to maintain the right to say what one thinks without thinking what one says.

However, after serious study of the benefits and drawbacks of an unfettered freedom in academe many have agreed that the costs and dangers of suppressing ideas will always be greater than the real or the fancied risks of permitting their expression. The encouraging of independence and originality of thought is a source of educational strength.

Controversy cannot be outlawed in our universities. Rather it must be presented there in the citadel of learning to guarantee the most reasoned argumentation, consideration, and conclusion by a free citizenry determining governmental action.

While there cannot be rights without obligations, neither can there be obligations without rights. Here do we discover the distinction between open and closed societies. A mature man insists upon freedom that he might thereby exercise responsibility.

The official catalog of the archdiocesan university includes this sentence: "Seton Hall takes a positive attitude toward the traditional American concern for liberty under law. Thus it is that she defends an academic freedom which respects the common good, the inviolable dignity of each person, and equality of opportunity for all."

Those among us who are disturbed by teach-ins might reflect upon these words of Justice Brandeis written decades ago: "If there be time to expose through discussion the falsehoods and fallacies, to avert the evil by the processes of education, the remedy to be applied is more speech, not enforced silence."

The Freedom Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 17, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on July 30, radio station WOKE, in Charleston, S.C., broadcast an editorial by its able president and general manager, Harry C. Weaver, on the Freedom Academy bill now pending in Congress. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[A WOKE radio editorial, July 30, 1965]

CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF THE FREEDOM ACADEMY BILL IS NOW A POSSIBILITY

(By Harry C. Weaver, president and general manager, WOKE, Charleston, S.C.)

Six years ago, during the 86th Congress a proposal was made by Congressman A. SYDNEY HERLONG, of Leesburg, Fla., that a Federal agency be established to be known as Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy.

On July 20, 1965 the House Committee on Un-American Activities, to which the Freedom Academy bill was referred, gave its unanimous approval of the final bill with some amendments, reported it out to the Committee of the Whole House and recommended that the Freedom Academy bill, as amended, be passed by the U.S. House of Representatives.

What is the purpose and objectives of the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy?

The formation of such an agency could be a most significant step forward in our land of freedom after so many years of hard endeavor to enact a comprehensive nonmilitary program for the United States and the free world in the global struggle against the swelling tide of communism. The purpose and objectives of the Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy would be to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States and other nations in the world struggle between freedom and communism; to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this Federal body of knowledge; and to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions. There is a crying need in our country today for such an institution as the Freedom Academy "to assist in the development of methods and means employable in both the governmental and private sectors to counter all forms of Communist political warfare, subversion, and insurgency, while seeking to preserve and build free and viable societies."

The companion bill to Congressman HERLONG's House legislation was introduced into the U.S. Senate by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, 2 months later in 1959 and finally passed the Senate on August 31, 1960. There was no opportunity for action on the House bill for Congress adjourned 1 day later. The present Senate bill (S. 1232) was introduced by Senator MUNDT and cosponsored by 11 other Senators. Senator MUNDT is very optimistic that with the unanimous vote of the House Committee on Un-American Activities will come serious consideration for early action by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It is Senator KARL MUNDT's conviction that the findings of the House committee sound anew the warning that we Americans cannot depend only upon military defenses in the cold war effort to preserve freedom. The Senator from South Dakota was greatly impressed with the House committee's six major points in its contention that "If this country and other non-Communist nations are to realize their full capacity to engage in the type of global struggle which has been forced upon them it is essential that a thoroughgoing program of research, education, and training in the area of Communist political warfare be established."

In preparing ourselves for psychological warfare with the enemies of freedom, we can better meet the Communist challenge if we know what the challenge is all about. We are yielding ground to communism which we need not yield if we have in hand a complete understanding of the most effective and appropriate methods for advancing freedom's cause. We of WOKE feel that such an anti-Communist agency as the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy would greatly benefit the cause of freedom through proper education of uninformed American citizens. We urge the people of the low country to write our two Senators and six Congressmen in Washington and urge their support and influence with other Senators and Congressmen for passage of this Senate and House Freedom Academy bill.

V-J Day and Our Fighting Men in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 17, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague, Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, second highest ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Far East and Pacific, recently gave an analytical firsthand report on the accomplishments and objectives of America's fighting men in Vietnam. He gave this presentation on August 13 to the Allied Veterans Council joint observance of V-J Day at Milwaukee where the theme fittingly was: "A Tribute to Our Fighting Men in Vietnam."

The close and accurate knowledge that Congressman ZABLOCKI has of the free world commitment against the spread of communism is of such great import to all Americans that I take exceptional pleasure in inserting into the Appendix his worthwhile address to the council, which is composed of 15 veterans organizations in Milwaukee County.

The address follows:

V-J DAY AND OUR FIGHTING MEN IN VIETNAM

(Speech of Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI at the Allied Veterans Council V-J Day Ceremonies, Milwaukee, Wis., Friday, Aug. 13, 1965)

It is indeed a privilege and an honor to have been asked by the Allied Veterans Council of Greater Milwaukee to participate in the events of this evening.

These V-J Day observances, sponsored by the council, have become an important annual event in our community. They have reminded us of the sacrifices which so many made in World War II in order that we might enjoy freedom and prosperity in our great land.

The Allied Veterans Council is particularly to be commended for having dedicated this evening's program to the American fighting men in Vietnam.

It is entirely fitting as we observe the 20th anniversary of the victory over Japan and the end of World War II, that we pay tribute to those who are fighting and dying to preserve freedom against Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

This occasion also affords an excellent opportunity to make certain meaningful comparisons between World War II and the present conflict in Vietnam.

Many of us recall the protests which accompanied increasing American involvement in World War II before Pearl Harbor. Each attempt by the Roosevelt administration to strengthen the Nation's defenses and assist our traditional Allies in Western Europe was met with criticism. Mother's marches and peace demonstrations were organized in an attempt to dissuade the military buildup which later proved not only necessary but vital to the security interests of our Nation.

In 1939 and 1940 it was fashionable in some quarters to say: "I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier." Others quoted President George Washington's advice about avoiding foreign entanglements.

Who were these peace-at-any-price advocates? For the most part they were well-intentioned, genuinely concerned individuals. They lacked, however, any real appre-

ing, the time seems to be now—or perhaps never—for the evolution of a stronger spirit from which growth and changes can spring; a stronger spirit to carry it, in the next years of its history, into a position of equal partnership and leadership with all elements of a total housing program."

THE FREEDOM ACADEMY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is my intention to address the Senate briefly each week in order to emphasize our need for legislation patterned after our Freedom Academy bill (S. 1232). I intend to present timely evidence supporting the contention behind the bill that we are yielding ground which we need not yield in our efforts to stem the expansion of aggressive communism.

To the many observers who support the Freedom Academy concept, this attitude that we are not so successful as we might be has required no argumentative support; and, naively perhaps, we have thought we needed no considerable evidential support in contending that our side of the world is not prepared to fight in the specific arena where the battle between Communist aggressors and their victims is being fought.

This arena is essentially the nonmilitary or only quasi-military arena. We Americans, who exhibit pride in our historic guerrilla-type warfare capabilities which we demonstrated so effectively during the French and Indian War, our American Revolution, and the conquest of the West, inherit from our ancestors a contempt for militarists like Braddock who refused to recognize the impotence of continental-type enemies against backwoods guerrilla bands, now find ourselves the ones who send million dollar jet aircraft armed with thousand-pound bombs against an ephemeral enemy whose operational capacities are so adroit that he may well not be there when the bomb arrives.

But the guerrilla game has gained sophistication, too, since we left it. Its political side is far more thorough now. Psychological warfare is mounted against a people by their enemies from within to soften their resistance to the more tangible guerrilla or quasi-military operation conducted in conjunction with it at the later stages of attack.

And we seem to stand by, wringing our hands, wondering what is going on as we see the will to resist among an ally's people wafting away like so much smoke.

The L. L. Sulzberger column in Wednesday's New York Times testifies to our need for the Freedom Academy. Listen to some poignant observations from this gifted observer of foreign affairs.

American defense plans during the past decade have carefully and expensively prepared to fight the only kind of war we are least likely to face. And we have not in any major sense prepared to fight the kind of war both Russia and China surely intend to press.

*** Moscow endorsed peaceful coexistence *** always reserved one vital area *** to support wherever possible "wars of liberation."

*** The modern elaboration of guerrilla techniques called "revolutionary warfare" by the Communists does not depend on

heavy weapons or atomic arsenals. It depends upon simultaneous organization of partisan units and civilian administrators who seek to rot a selected country from within like fungus inside an apparently healthy tree.

*** Even today, when we have growing special service counter guerrilla units, some with kindergarten training in revolutionary warfare, we are abysmally behind.

*** We have nothing capable of offsetting what revolutionary warfare calls "parallel hierarchies" ***—the secret political apparatus that undermines morale and softens up the population.

*** while we are engaged in blue-printing superplanes and superrockets, we risk losing the world to guerrillas.

*** The quintessential problem is how to defeat revolutionary warfare ***.

Not merely the aggressive Chinese but the relatively less aggressive Russians are committed to sponsor "wars of liberation." Despite this glaring truth, both in weapons and in training we are basically prepared alone for the war our adversaries don't intend to start.

Those, Mr. President, are Sulzberger's words. I ask unanimous consent that his article "Foreign Affairs: One Kind of War We Can't Fight" from the New York Times of March 3, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times,
Mar. 3, 1965]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: ONE KIND OF WAR WE CAN'T FIGHT

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—Some wars become associated with the names of individuals, and thus we have the Napoleonic Wars, the Black Hawk War and the War of Jenkins' Ear. There have been those who have sought to label the Vietnamese campaign "McNamara's war," after the U.S. Secretary of Defense and, politics aside, this is not wholly unjust.

McNAMARA'S INFLUENCE

For Secretary McNamara has clearly had more influence in our evolving Vietnam policy than his senior colleague, Secretary Rusk. McNamara has been a familiar Saigon visitor; his former military right hand, General Taylor, is now Ambassador there; and United States-Indochina strategy is more heavily marked by the Pentagon than by the State Department.

American defense plans during the past decade have carefully and expensively prepared to fight the only kind of war we are least likely to face. And we have not in any major sense prepared to fight the kind of war both Russia and China surely intend to press.

When post-Stalinist Moscow endorsed peaceful coexistence it always reserved one vital area. It openly promised to support, wherever possible, what it calls "wars of liberation." Khrushchev tried to play a trick on us in Cuba, but he had to back down because he was patently not engaged in a liberation war—only in directly threatening our vital interests. Our strategy was prepared for such a showdown.

However, when the Communists stick to their own rules they have a demonstrated advantage. The modern elaboration of guerrilla techniques called "revolutionary warfare" by the Communists does not depend on heavy weapons, or atomic arsenals. It depends upon simultaneous organization of partisan units and civilian administrators who seek to rot a selected country from within like fungus inside an apparently healthy tree.

For years we refused to face the fact that,

equipped as we were for holocaust, we had neither the trained manpower nor the political apparatus to fight revolutionary warfare. To some degree, under both President Kennedy and the brilliant McNamara, this was rectified—but only in part. Even today, when we have growing special service counter guerrilla units, some with kindergarten training in revolutionary warfare, we are abysmally behind.

It is expensive and ineffectual to blow up jungle acreage or fill it with paratroopers in search of vanishing guerrillas. And we have nothing capable of offsetting what revolutionary warfare calls parallel hierarchies (known in Vietnam as Dich-Van) the secret political apparatus that undermines morale and softens up the population.

SHIFTING STRATEGY

U.S. strategy tends to shift according to availability of weapons systems. It has moved from massive retaliation to flexible response and from land bases to seaborne armadas. But, while we are engaged in blue-printing superplanes and superrockets, we risk losing the world to guerrillas.

Vietnam is McNamara's war because, in fighting it, we have overstressed the military and ignored the political aspect. We have, furthermore, been preoccupied with selling an American way of life and political philosophy unsuited to the people we would help.

FACING THE THREAT

The heart of the crisis is not truly in Vietnam. The quintessential problem is how to defeat revolutionary warfare. Elsewhere in Asia and Africa we will continue to face the threat of this technique no matter what happens to the Vietnamese. That is inescapable.

Not merely the aggressive Chinese but the relatively less aggressive Russians are committed to sponsor wars of liberation. Despite this glaring truth, both in weapons and in training, we are basically prepared alone for the war our adversaries don't intend to start.

Mr. MUNDT. A nucleus proposal of the Freedom Academy bill (S. 1232) which I introduced in this session of the Senate together with the following sponsors: Senators CASE, DODD, DOUGLAS, FONG, HICKENLOOPER, LAUSCHE, MILLER, PROUTY, PROXMIER, SCOTT, and SMATHERS, is that the U.S. Government should direct priority attention to providing adequate training for our own people and for our allies' people in this crucial area of nonmilitary-psychological warfare aggression.

We propose to prepare our people who face this test in the field to recognize nonmilitary aggression for what it is in all its variable forms. We propose to enable them to adopt appropriate counter-techniques and counterstrategies against such aggression.

Maintaining that our people should be so prepared is not tantamount to urging our adoption of Communist tactics. But we can better meet this challenge if we know what the challenge is all about and have in hand a complete understanding of the most effective and appropriate methods which we can employ for advancing freedoms cause.

THE PRESIDENT'S WAR ON POVERTY—SPEECH BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, at a recent dinner of the New Jersey Chamber of Commerce, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] delivered an excellent speech in support of the President's

war on poverty. Senator WILLIAMS' fine work with America's migratory farmworkers has given him a great knowledge of the problem of poverty and what can be done to solve it. In his speech, the Senator from New Jersey pointed out that our attack on poverty is motivated not only by humanitarian concerns, but also by sound commonsense. The point Senator WILLIAMS made—that we must take the poor off the relief rolls, and put them on the payrolls and the tax rolls—is a good one. I think all Senators will be interested in Senator WILLIAMS' remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR WILLIAMS FOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DINNER, FEBRUARY 4, 1965

For too many of us, the phrases "Great Society" and "war on poverty" are glib campaign slogans, adman phrases without real meaning. And with the easy stoicism of the prosperous, we forget them and lull our consciences with the thought that the biblical thought that "the poor are always with us" is still as true today as it was 2,000 years ago.

To a great degree it is still true today. With growing prosperity, the percentage of families living in poverty—or with incomes of less than \$3,000—declined from 32 percent in 1947 to 19 percent in 1963. The question and the challenge now before us is whether this level of poverty has reached an irreducible minimum and whether the number of poverty stricken will remain, as has the number of unemployed, an impassable barrier which even our great and expanding economy will be unable to cross.

I do not believe that this is true. As a Nation, we have made, and will make, a tangible commitment in hard cash that it is not true. This year the President will ask for one and a half billion dollars to be spent on the war on poverty. In other words, the war on poverty is not a campaign slogan—it is a billion-dollar pledge by the United States that the age-old precedents of history can be overturned. When the Congress passes this legislation—as I think it will—we will have given hard evidence of our determination as a Nation of free men that we will not allow, through our inaction, poverty to spread its cancer within our borders.

The idea of a war on poverty is both amazing and exciting. It is amazing because we are the first nation in history to turn our great resources and wealth to a practical attempt to lift the poor and the disadvantaged from the rut of despair. And it is exciting because we have set ourselves the almost revolutionary task of proving that the sad teachings of history are wrong.

But as businessmen, as taxpayers, and as legislators we must ask ourselves some tough questions. Is the war on poverty a fool's errand, a quixotic tilting at windmills doomed to failure from the beginning by hard economic fact? I do not think so. I think that this is a war that must be fought—and can be won.

The reasons for waging this war are not only idealistic and humanitarian. If they were, I doubt that a nation as hardheaded as we are would support the President's war on poverty. Our motives involve plain, honest dollars and cents. For you and I are supporting, at a great cost, one-fifth of the Nation. Our tax dollars—whether paid to the Federal Government, the State, or to local government—are supporting these people at a subsistence level to the tune of more

than \$4 billion a year. And this is money spent for outright relief. It treats the symptoms, not the disease. We are doling out expensive aspirin where penicillin is needed.

Our free enterprise economy depends on rising consumption and rising demand. Already idle plant capacity has created a persistently high level of unemployment. Yet until recently we have been willing to tolerate the fact that almost 20 percent of our population are nonspenders or nonconsumers. From an economic point of view they are a useless deadweight holding back growth and expansion.

According to the Council of Economic Advisers, the median income of a poor family is \$1,800 per annum. If we assume that an income of almost twice that figure is a poverty-level income, then this median income figure means that the situation is much worse than we had believed it to be.

But even if we accept the fact that it makes good economic sense to do something about the problem of poverty, what steps can we take to produce practical results for the dollars we spend? The most obvious and immediate cause of poverty is the lack of education and the skills suitable for 20th century industry. And what might be called "industrial illiteracy" is passed on from generation to generation.

The uneducated and unskilled parent will leave unemployment and the address of the welfare office as his only heritage to his children. Therefore, the main attack of the war on poverty is directed at lack of education and particularly at lack of education among young people. The Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and the work study programs all will invest large sums of money in training and preparing our youth to meet the demands of space-age America.

Even in our prosperous Nation poverty is widespread. Despite the fact that New Jersey's citizens have one of the highest average per capita incomes in the Nation, our State is still a major participant in the war on poverty.

In New Jersey, 17 communities have already formed community action organizations—citizen action groups which will mobilize the resources of local communities to solve effectively their own problems. Six of these community action programs have already received grants totaling more than \$650,000. This is the practical cooperation between Federal and local governments which will develop the best means for eliminating poverty in New Jersey.

In addition more than \$13½ million has been granted to New Jersey for a Job Corps center, work-study program, and for Neighborhood Youth Corps programs.

Governor Hughes, John Bullitt, and community leaders have done a fine job in putting New Jersey in the forefront of the war on poverty.

There is already good evidence that a concerted attack on poverty is not only a moral necessity but also produces positive results. One aspect of poverty that I know well is the living and working conditions of the migratory farmworkers who harvest our crops.

Three years ago, the Congress passed the first major legislation in more than 30 years directed specifically at migrant farmworkers—the Migrant Health Act of 1962. With funds provided by this law, New Jersey's department of health has been able to provide the basic elements of health care too often denied to migrant farmworkers. Three years ago a mother would deliver her child without ever having seen a doctor—and sometimes even in the field where she worked. And that child would quite likely grow up without even having been given the basic immunization against diphtheria, smallpox, and polio, which most babies receive almost automatically. Yet in 2 years we have been able to change all that. Today

basic medical care is available to the migrant worker who comes to our State, and our farmworkers are no longer treated as remnants of a medieval past.

Our war on poverty is not only a moral imperative, it is an economic imperative. If we can take the poor off the relief rolls and put them on payrolls and tax rolls, we will have turned one-fifth of a nation from a financial burden into a productive asset. But more importantly we will have fulfilled the dream of the men who began this Nation, and who were the true founders of the Great Society. The Great Society is not a new and revolutionary idea—it is the modern expression of the vision of Jefferson, Hamilton, Adams, and Washington. And we can thank God that we have in our power the means and the resources to make and to build the great and happy America which they foresaw. It is not only to our economic advantage to do so—it is our solemn duty to do so.

"BONANZA IN SUGARBEETS ELUDING KANSAS FARMERS"—ARTICLE BY SENATOR PEARSON

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the February 20 issue of the Kansas Farmer featured an excellent article by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], in which he ably outlines the problems our present sugar policies are creating for farmers, not only in his own State, but in all areas interested in, and capable of, producing sugarbeets.

Under present policies, the U.S. consumer is dependent upon foreign producers for 40 percent of his sugar supplies. Our State Department has been insistent on maintaining this policy, even though the folly of such a course was clearly demonstrated when a world sugar shortage developed in 1963.

It makes little sense to require the American sugarbeet producer to reduce his plantings, as is being done for the 1965 crop, while continuing to seek the same high level of sugar supplies from foreign sources.

We are attempting to control the buildup of surpluses of many of our crops, chiefly wheat, feed grains, and cotton. Sugarbeets can economically be produced in many areas now devoted largely to these crops. Additional acreages of sugarbeets can increase the income capacity of farmers, help reduce the surplus problems we face with other crops, and provide the United States with a stable supply of sugar at reasonable prices.

Mr. President, the article written by Senator PEARSON, one of the most knowledgeable and understanding Members of the Senate on agriculture matters, is an excellent presentation of the problems faced by the American sugarbeet industry. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BONANZA IN SUGARBEETS ELUDING KANSAS FARMERS

(By JAMES B. PEARSON, U.S. Senator)

Sugarbeets can give Kansas' agricultural economy a fresh new look.

The potential that exists for increased production of sugarbeets in Kansas is substantial. However, this potential will be lost

August 5, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

18773

This action by Young Americans for Freedom was called irresponsible pressures. Does that mean that anyone who disagrees with administration policy is irresponsible? Should we do away with our Bill of Rights in order to secure unanimity on foreign policy?

Young Americans for Freedom is a group that represents the best of our youth. They number many Phi Beta Kappas, campus presidents, and leaders among their membership. They have supported President Johnson in his Vietnam policy. How many other so-called groups in this Nation have spoken out in support of our policy in Vietnam?

It was said that the rubber company incident was "a case study in the defeat of an important and carefully considered policy of the U.S. Government by irresponsible private interests, aided and abetted by the failure of Government officials actively to support the the President's established policy."

Now all the policies of our Government are important and presumably carefully considered, but this does not mean that they are necessarily correct. There were many in the Congress that held that the policy of the then administration with respect to Cuba was correct in 1962, and that certain Republicans were being irresponsible in their criticism of that policy, until it was discovered that our good friend Nikita Khrushchev had planted ICBM's in Cuba. Then suddenly that policy was changed.

It is a well-known fact that the Executive, and in particular our State Department, constantly send out people and information designed to secure public support of our official policies. Should this right be denied to private citizens and organizations?

The right of individuals and groups to protest has been upheld in the courts time and time again. And this does and should include foreign policy. The courts specifically have upheld the right of our American maritime trade unions to boycott merchandise from Communist countries or ships which trade with our Cuban Communist enemy.

What is perhaps even more astonishing, another rubber company was attacked for its decision not to build a synthetic rubber plant in Rumania. Should not any company have the right to choose whether or not to build bridges to satellite Europe, and especially so when they state that they were acting, in their opinion, in the national interest?

Many of us feel that this avowed policy of building bridges to the Communist world is open to serious question. Should it not be that the Communist world ought to build the bridges, not we? The Young Americans for Freedom feel, as do many of us, that by aiding Communist governments, we may betray our highest ideals. We certainly do not help the Rumanian people by assisting their Communist government to maintain itself in power. Who truly speaks for the Rumanian people, living under totalitarian communism? Why should we lend respectability to a government imposed upon them by force?

Now it is contended that Young Americans for Freedom has stopped two industrial giants in their tracks and upended the whole State Department. Actually, I wonder if perhaps there is not a little more to the story than that? Does not this action really represent the opinion of the majority of our people?

It is now popular in Washington to refer to a consensus. Does this mean we should all march like lemmings down to the sea for the sake of accommodation with the Communist world? Young Americans for Freedom may not espouse a line of thought popular with this administration, but they speak realistically in a world where one system or the other is bound to prevail because the Communist definition of peace presupposes the liquidation of all non-Communist nations. If these young people do not understand why we should bolster the economy of Communist nations, then I confess I share their questioning.

So, Mr. Speaker, instead of criticism we should express pride in the understanding of the world situation and patriotism demonstrated by Young Americans for Freedom.

FREEDOM ACADEMY PLAN BACKED

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, last night's edition of the Washington Evening Star contained an editorial by Mr. James J. Kilpatrick entitled "Freedom Academy Plan Backed." As the sponsor of the bill which is now awaiting a rule I can testify to the accuracy of Mr. Kilpatrick's statements. He has captured the essence of the proposal in a brief but comprehensive description of some of the history and by citing some of the objectives of this legislation. H.R. 9713 is a bill which deals with national security and the cold war. It deserves the attention and the serious consideration of the Members of this body. I commend this editorial to the Congress and hope it will be studied and reflected upon by each Member.

NEIL MACNEIL ON CONGRESS AND THE INTELLECTUAL COMMUNITY

(Mr. ELLSWORTH (at the request of Mrs. REID of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Neil MacNeil, congressional correspondent for Time magazine, has made one of the most perceptive and compelling statements I have seen on Congress and its image in American society. The occasion was the George Washington University American Assembly at Airlie House, Warrenton, Va., on May 14. I include it at this point and urge my colleagues to read and study it—and I am taking steps to see that it is circulated widely in the intellectual community:

CONGRESS AND THE INTELLECTUAL COMMUNITY

The theme of this conference, "Congress and America's Future," carries the implicit suggestion, in today's context, that the radically new world aborning requires basic alterations in the legislative branch of our Government. We live, obviously, at a time of convulsive economic and social change. We stand at the threshold of an age of technological miracles, begging the imagination, that will transform life on this planet and bridge the far reaches of space. Confronted with this revolutionary prospect, concerned and anxious citizens question whether the American Congress, constructed by a primitive society in the 18th century, can serve as an effective instrument of government today and in the future.

This conference, reflecting that anxious concern, has met to appraise Congress as a political institution, to weigh and consider its assets and liabilities, and to propose, if possible, ways and means for Congress better to meet the immense complexities of the world of tomorrow. I don't propose here to offer a new assessment of Congress to compile another catalog of its sins and virtues, or to try to devise a better parliamentary structure. Rather I want to speak of a more fundamental problem, and that is the double task of making a valid assessment and of proposing changes that Congress can be persuaded to adopt.

No matter how telling a critique of Congress this conference makes, no matter how rational and reasonable the proposals it suggests, the all-important fact is that Congress traditionally has resisted all outside interference with its formal processes. By constitutional grant, the House and Senate hold the exclusive power to determine their own rules. But it is not alone this constitutional prerogative that prompts Congress to ignore proposals for institutional change from outside its halls. A far more personal reason lies at the core of its resistance.

I have heard it said that Congress does not know or does not care what the people of this country think of it, and that this congressional indifference has created a dangerous schism between Congress and the public. I disagree with that analysis. It was offered by a critic who regarded Congress as "outrageously unrepresentative" and out of touch with the American people. Congress cares deeply what the public thinks of it and of all other things. But almost every Member of Congress—four out of every five—has been elected and reelected and reelected again by a wide margin of his people. It is difficult to persuade such a man that he does not reflect his constituents or that they disapprove of him or the place they send him to.

There is, however, a dangerous schism in Congress' relations with the outside world. It is the yawning chasm that separates Congress and the intellectual community. There are many reasons for this separation, and I wish to discuss them in some detail, but this estrangement between Congress and the intellectual community is the primary cause that prompts Congress to reject out of hand almost any intended help from outsiders.

Congress, institutionally, feels toward its critics in the intellectual community much the way the catfish felt toward the fisherman. "Hold still, catfish," the fisherman said. "I only want to gut you."

In our time, the intellectual community seems to want to denigrate Congress at every turn. If it is not a rubber stamp Congress, it is a do-nothing Congress. Most of the reforms proposed by outsiders reveal an emotional commitment to the President and his legislative program. At times, this commitment almost amounts to a sense of presidential infallibility. Many congressional

critics tend to regard struggles over legislation in purely moral terms, rather than as power struggles between competing political philosophies. Like bullet-vote voters, they tend to praise or damn Congress, depending on whether Congress passed or rejected their favored bills. In at least some instances, they are confused about the realities of congressional life, and, thus, in their proposed reforms, they strike at symptoms of the disease they diagnose and not the disease itself. An example of this is the continuing controversy over the House Rules Committee.

The Members of Congress have valid cause for reacting with suspicion to much of the intellectual community, for a latent hostility toward Congress permeates the thinking of many leaders of public opinion outside Congress. It is evident in the books of political scientists, in newspaper editorials, and even in the witticisms of our humorists. It is most evident of all in many of the reforms of Congress that are suggested. Too often, proposed reforms smack of an obvious intent to reduce Congress from its status as a separate and independent branch of the Federal Government. The Members of Congress, whether Democrats or Republicans, liberals or conservatives, are jealous of the prerogatives of Congress, and they fight tenaciously to maintain them.

This dichotomy between Congress and the intellectual community is no new thing. It has existed for decades. In 1925, Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio, as Speaker of the House of Representatives, referred to this longstanding animosity toward Congress in his years of service. "During the whole of that time," Longworth said, "we have been attacked, denounced, despised, hunted, harried, blamed, looked down upon, excoriated and flayed." And then he added, significantly: "I refuse to take it personally."

Longworth's refusal to take the criticism personally was not mere intransigence. It was the reaction of a man who felt keenly that the criticism was not warranted, that the assessment of Congress on which the criticism was based was not valid. His words summarized the feelings of Congressmen since time out of mind, and they summarize the feelings of Congressmen now.

Members of Congress, as a whole, normally do not listen to the political scientists, and the political scientists do not listen to the politicians on Capitol Hill. This has produced the long estrangement between Congress and the intellectual community. Its roots lie in a fundamental disagreement on just what Congress is and is not. The political scientist's understanding and description of Congress often are incomprehensible to the Members of Congress, and theirs are frequently incomprehensible to the political scientist. The mutual enmity, borne of this disagreement, has prevented a meaningful dialog between the two. The resulting animosity and recrimination has made it difficult for anyone to stand between them as referee or as friend of the court, for he faces assault on one side as an apologist for incompetence and on the other for moralistic sophistry.

The hostility is at every hand. In speeches in the House and Senate, as well as newspaper editorials and the books of political scientists. Take the American Assembly's current volume, "The Congress and America's Future," on which this conference is based. In his introduction, David Truman has described with aptness the image of the typical Congressman as seen by the intellectual community. "The cartoon symbol," Professor Truman wrote, "of the bewhiskered, frock-coated, and bungling old man, familiar to all newspaper readers, effectively illustrates a persistent stereotype." But Truman's description has a greater application than he intended, for it will serve as well for the Congressman's image of the typical po-

litical scientist: A bewhiskered, frock-coated, bungling old man.

The Congressman repays the intellectual in kind for his hostility. It's a natural response. If the intellectual regards the word "politician" as an epithet, the typical Congressman equates the professor with the pedant. If there is justice in both views, at least in some cases, the effect is to impede any real communication between Capitol Hill and the academic world. And this, in turn, has created that dangerous chasm between Congress and the intellectual community. In plain terms, they do not understand each other, and too frequently they do not bother to try to understand each other.

The loss is the Nation's loss, for Congress needs help in meeting the challenges of today and the promise of America's future. Congress needs the help of the academic world: The imagination, the skill, and the talents of men and women who can help Congress fathom the depths of its institutional needs, and then bring forward viable remedies to meet them.

Parliamentary practice, like law, is based not on logic, but on experience. It is pragmatic, rather than scholastic. It is sentimental, rather than scientific. Without an understanding of the inwardness of the congressional experience, the psychology of the congressional mind, the student seeking meaning of Congress and its ways is lost. He cannot produce that understanding by logic.

Out of its traditions come the instincts of Congress toward itself, the other branches of the Government, and the outside world. It operates on a live-and-let-live philosophy that is not merely a vulgar and amoral indifference to ethical considerations. Involved here is a tolerance toward opposing views, a willingness to let those other views be voiced and voted, a recognition of the fundamental right of disagreement, which is the heart of a free society. If Congress tolerates the mountebanks and demagogues in its ranks, on the grounds that they too were elected, it respects only its men of character, industry, ability, and sincerity.

The Members of Congress share a sense, if not the same sense or to the same intensity as the academic world, that Congress must change now, as it has always changed, to meet new conditions and new tasks. It is this sense that prompted Congress this year to order unanimously a new study of its procedures and organization. The formal hearings for this congressional reappraisal began this week. But it is scarcely possible for the academic world to contribute to this change, so long as political scientists think of Congress as a loathsome thing and Congressmen regard professors as merely misinformed cranks. There is a pressing need to build bridges across the chasm that separates Congress and the intellectual community and to develop, eventually, a working partnership between them.

In this estrangement, I do not for a moment exonerate Congress from its share of the blame. Frequently, the Members of Congress have been, and are, guilty of a self-serving complacency about Congress and the rules and practices of Congress. They have been guilty, as charged, of entrenched parochialism and root-hog-or-die attitude toward projects for their districts and States. Too often, they have been guilty of what Senator Fulbright once called "the swinish blight of anti-intellectualism." The Members of Congress, many of them, bear a heavy responsibility for the ill repute of Congress in the intellectual community.

But a large share of the blame falls also on the academic community, and on none more importantly than the political scientists, those most responsible to interpret for us all the meaning and substance of Congress. In large part, I suggest, the political

scientists are to blame for the discrepancy between the Congressman's understanding of Congress and that of the intellectual community. Here, it seems to me, the essential fault lies in the method of many political scientists in their examination of Congress, and method is all important to intellectual discipline and validity.

From the beginning, many political scientists have approached the study of Congress with techniques strikingly at variance with those of other academic disciplines. I have already suggested that this approach has been ethical and moralistic, rather than scientific. Too many political scientists have not learned what Lord Acton called "the lesson of intellectual detachment." Often they have seemed more intent on reciting the litany of reform than in describing the place with precision and understanding. They have seemed more anxious to devise new ways to alter Congress than to learn how it truly functions. Too many have not followed the dictum of Thomas Huxley a century ago: "Sit down before fact as a little child, be prepared to give up every preconceived notion . . . or you shall learn nothing."

Every discipline has its methods, its techniques grown of usage, to acquire intelligence and to make judgments from that intelligence. In Shakespeare's play, "King Henry V," the night before the battle of Agincourt, a messenger reports to the Lord High Constable of France that the English Army is camped within 1,500 paces of his tents. The Constable of France has but one question: "Who has measured the ground?" It's a pertinent question for the military tactician, or the historian or the political scientist. In rough terms, I would like to sketch briefly the differences I have found in the methods of many American political scientists and those of American historiography, the discipline in which I was trained.

The American historian reflects a tradition running back to Francis Parkman, whose great history is right now being republished. As a young man in the 1840's, Parkman began to prepare himself to write the history of the struggle between England and France for the North American continent. A Protestant, he went to Rome to study the Catholic faith and ritual. He lived with the Indians not only the broken tribes of the East, but the wild savages of the Great West. He examined the fort at Ticonderoga, and he traced Montcalm's battle lines. He visited and explored all the places on the continent that were a part of his history. He measured the ground.

Parkman spared nothing, least of all himself, that he might know his subject totally. He would not be satisfied with mere book learning, although here too he exhausted all known sources of information that might help illuminate his theme. He would not, however, be satisfied with secondhand accounts. "It is evident," Parkman once wrote, "that other study than that of the closet is indispensable."

Parkman wrote a history, nine volumes long, that remains one of the great landmarks of American letters and scholarship. His books still ring with the authenticity of a writer who steeped himself in the life and spirit of the time he described. His books still shout with the excitement of that vivid time and the robust men—French, English, and Indian—who shaped it. Parkman thus set the tradition of American historians. Out of that Parkman heritage, American historians scorn the merely popular and superficial. At the same time, they view with contempt the pretensions of the pale antiquarian who has never left his library. They revere the scholar whose sympathies, as Henry Osborne Taylor once wrote, quiver to understand and feel as the men and women before him.